

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully acknowledges receipt of the Final Office Action mailed February 10, 2005.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) or Japanese Application No. JP 202124340 (*JP '340*); and (2) objected to claims 4 and 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, Applicant proposes to amend claims 1 and 5. Upon entry of this Amendment after Final, claims 1-5 will remain pending in this application. Of these claims, claim 1 is independent.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the amendments of claims 1 and 5. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4 and 5. However, for at least the reasons set forth in the following arguments, Applicant believes that base claim 1 is allowable as currently amended. Accordingly, Applicant has not rewritten claims 4 and 5 in independent form at this time.

Based on the foregoing amendments, Applicant traverses each of the above rejections and respectfully requests reconsideration for the reasons that follow.

I. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3

Applicant submits that currently amended independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, including *AAPA* or *JP '340*, and the other art of record. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest each element of the invention recited in independent claim 1. In particular, the applied references, taken alone or in combination, at least fail to teach or suggest a bracket comprising: a connector housing having a cable wiring surface onto which a cable is wired; a bus bar circuit disposed in an exposed state on the cable wiring surface; a pressure welding edge formed on the bus bar circuit connecting the cable to the bus bar circuit by pressure welding; and a lower cable support rib disposed on the cable wiring surface supporting the cable such that the cable contacts the pressure welding edge but not the bus bar circuit.

Applicant notes that in order to properly anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, "either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, 8th ed., 2001.

AAPA or *JP '340* teaches a flat cable (20) contacting a bus bar circuit disposed on the cable wiring surface of the connector housing (12) (emphasis added). Furthermore, ribs (14a and 14b) do not prevent the cable (20) from contacting the bus bar circuit, rather ribs (14a and 14b) secure the cable (20) in place. Accordingly, *AAPA* or *JP '340* necessarily fails to teach the claimed combination including a positive

recitation of “a lower cable support rib disposed on the cable wiring surface supporting the cable such that the cable contacts the pressure welding edge but not the bus bar circuit,” as recited in proposed amended claim 1 (emphasis added). For at least these reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn and claim 1 be allowed.

Moreover, claims 2-5 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1. In addition, at least some of the dependent claims recite unique combinations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, and therefore some also are separately patentable.

II. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 2-5 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-5 in condition for allowance. As noted above, Applicant submits that the proposed amendments of claims 1 and 5 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 9, 2005

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220